



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/611,665	07/01/2003	Jeremy Roschelle	SRI/4335-3	5392
52197	7590	10/15/2007	EXAMINER	
PATTERSON & SHERIDAN, LLP			HADIZONOOZ, BANAFSHEH	
SRI INTERNATIONAL			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
595 SHREWSBURY AVENUE				3714
SUITE 100				
SHREWSBURY, NJ 07702				
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			10/15/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/611,665	ROSCHELLE ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Banafsheh Hadizonooz	3714

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 18 July 2007.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-17,20-51 and 54-79 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-17,20-51 and 54-79 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on 07 January 2003 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) Other: _____

Detailed Action

In response to the correspondence filed on 07/18/2007, claims 1-17, 20-51 and 54-79 are pending. This office action is made Non-Final.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-17, 20-51 and 54-79 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lockwood (US 6,554,618) in view of Kershaw (US 5,565,316). With regard to claims 1, 21, 35, 55, 69, and 74, and the limitation of forwarding a query pertaining to a structured entity having a plurality of parts (as in claims 1, 21, 35, 55), and a means for forwarding a query pertaining to a structured entity having a plurality of parts and for forwarding a plurality of response templates for answering the query (as in claims 69 and 74) Lockwood disclose that a test may be presented to user (Col. 6: 57-64). With regard to the feature wherein the query pertains to a structured entity having a plurality of parts, Lockwood discloses that a test may contain a plurality of questions pertaining to various aspects of a specific subject, such as Algebra (Col. 6:64 - Col. 7: 19). Additionally, a user of the invention could choose to include any type of questions for any subject; as desired.

Lockwood does not specifically disclose the limitations of forwarding a plurality of response templates for answering the query, and receiving a response from a first client

device wherein the response comprises a completed response template linking a plurality of parts of the structured entity (or a means for receiving a response from a first client device, wherein the response comprises a completed response template linking a plurality of parts of the structured entity, as in claim 69). However, Kershaw discloses a system for computer based testing wherein the users are permitted to select a template and the response type and structure (See Col.16, 22-Col.18, 5,Table 3, and Figs, 43-47). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate the features of Kershaw's invention into the system and method of Lockwood in order to design a more interactive learning system.

With regard to claims 2, 36, 70, and 75, and the limitation of receiving a response from a second client device, wherein the response comprises a completed response template linking a plurality of parts of the structured entity, Lockwood discloses that a plurality of users may be provided tests (Col. 3: 7-18; Col. 14: 17-43).

With regard to claims 3, 21, 22, 37, 55, 56, and 71, and the limitation of aggregating (or a means for aggregating, as in claim 71) the responses from the first and second client devices to produce and aggregated result (as in claims 3 and 37), and providing a response to an aggregating device from a first client device, wherein the response comprises a completed response template linking a plurality of parts of the structured entity (as in claims 21 and 55), and providing a response to an aggregating device from a second client device, wherein the response comprises a completed response template linking a plurality of parts of the structured entity (as in claims 22 and 56), Lockwood discloses that assessment reports may be generated based on the students'

performances on tests, and that aggregated results, such as average grades, may be included (Col. 18: 62- Col. 19: 56; Figs. 8, 10).

With regard to claims 4, 5, 23-25, 38, 39, 57-59, 72, and 73, and the limitations of forwarding the aggregated result to the first or second client device (as in claims 4, 38, 59, and 72), and forwarding the response of the first client device to the second client device (as in claims 5, 25, 39, and 73), requesting for an aggregated result (or means for requesting, as in claim 76) of the responses from the first and second client device (as in claims 23 and 57), receiving the aggregated result (as in claims 24, 58, and 77), and receiving the response of the first client device by the second device (as in claims 25, 59, and 78), Lockwood discloses that a server, connected to a reports database, may be used for transmission and reception of data from the client computers in the system (Col. 13: 17-34), and that students may be provided with reports (Col. 4: 21-32). Lockwood discloses examples of reports which may include aggregated results (Figs. 8 and 10). Therefore, a user of one of the client computers (such as a student) could receive reports (i.e., aggregated results) on a client device. Additionally, Lockwood discloses that a student's test responses may be transmitted from one computer to another computer in order to be evaluated (Col. 7: 20-39; Col. 14:58 - Col. 15: 12).

With regard to claims 6-14, 26-34, 40-48, and 60-68, and the limitations wherein the structured entity comprises a sequential multi-step process (as in claims 6, 26, 40, and 60), a literary work or a portion of a literary work (as in claims 7, 27, 41, and 61), a poem (as in claims 8, 28, 42, and 62), a computer program (as in claims 9, 29, 43, and 63), a musical composition (as in claims 10, 30, 44, and 64), a biological organism (as

in claims 11, 31, 45, and 65), a computer data structure (as in claims 12, 32, 46, and 66), an architectural structure (as in claims 13, 33, 47, and 67), and a chemical process (as in claims 14, 34, 48, and 68), the invention of Lockwood is inherently capable of these features, since they pertain solely to the specific subject matter being addressed in the test (or query). A user of the invention of Lockwood could decide to use test questions pertaining to any of the recited types of subject matter.

With regard to claims 15 and 49, and the limitation wherein the response contains an input entered by using the first client device, Kershaw discloses that a user may provide answers to the test using a computer (See Abstract).

With regard to claims 16 and 50, and the limitation wherein the input comprises filling in at least one response template, Kershaw discloses that a user may answer questions via a browser interface (e.g. computer) (See Abstract).

With regard to claims 17, 20, 51, and 54, and the limitation wherein the input comprises linking the at least one response template to at least one part of the structured entity (as in claims 17 and 51), and wherein the input comprises at least one tag (as in claims 20 and 54), Lockwood discloses that a user may take a test and input answers to the test questions, as previously described (Col. 14: 58- Col. 15: 12). Therefore, the questions may comprise any subject matter or type of question desired by a user of the invention, which could include questions (i.e., response templates) requiring a specific type of answer (i.e., linking the question to the general subject matter of the test, or inputting a tag).

With regard to claim 79, and the limitation of a first client device, Lockwood discloses a

plurality of workstations (Items 310, 360, and 370 in Fig. 3). With regard to the limitation of an aggregating device for forwarding a query pertaining to a structured entity having a plurality of parts and a plurality of response templates for answering the query to the first client device, where the aggregating device receives a response from the first client device, wherein the response comprises a completed response template linking a plurality of parts of the structured entity, Lockwood discloses that computers may be used to implement the features of the invention (Col. 11: 49-60).

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claim rejection under 35 U.S.C 102(e) has been considered but is moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Applicant argues that Lockwood does not disclose a structured entity having a plurality of structurally interrelated parts. The applicant further points out that the gateway test disclosed in Lockwood's invention only focuses on elementary foundations of a particular subject. The examiner notes that Lockwood discloses multi-part questions related to a broad subject. The level of complexity of each part and designing the questions such that they are interrelated is merely a matter of design choice.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Banafsheh Hadizonooz whose telephone number is 571-272-1242. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Robert Pezzuto can be reached on (571) 272- 6788. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

BH



ROBERT E. PEZZUTO
SUPERVISORY PRIMARY EXAMINER